

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-45

**Stephanie Kost**

**From:** Trey Rust [treyrust1@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 29, 2003 9:47 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

Trey Rust  
6406 Julian Street  
Springfield, VA 22150-4114

October 29, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

RECEIVED  
DEC 19 2003  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Trey

96-45

**Stephanie Kost**

**From:** Therese Vaughn [piguana123@mail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 26, 2003 1:25 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Note Regarding USF

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Therese Vaughn  
9213 Long Branch Pkwy  
Silver Spring, MD 20901-3642

September 26, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Therese S. Vaughn

**Stephanie Kost**

**From:** sherri kay [spyndr@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 29, 2003 2:38 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

sherri kay  
8390 NW 25th St.  
miami, FL 33122-1504

October 29, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Sherri

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** sherri kay [spyndr@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 29, 2003 1:49 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

sherri kay  
8390 NW 25th St.  
miami, FL 33122-1504

RECEIVED

DEC 1 9 2003

October 29, 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

sherri

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Robert OConnor [tracfone2@rocnnet.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 02, 2003 7:13 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** USF Changes Concern Me

Robert OConnor  
09411412951  
8 Great Oak Lane  
South China, ME 04358-5330

November 2, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Robert OConnor  
09411412951

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Stephanie Kost**

---

**From:** Ray Urbanz [rurbanz@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 12, 2003 7:50 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Minorities Opposed to Change in USF Collection

Ray Urbanz  
10015 Bayreuth Dr, SE  
Huntsville, AL 35803-1163

November 12, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Ray Urbanz

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Stephanie Kost**

---

**From:** pat engel [pengel@idi.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 03, 2003 11:32 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Keep The USF Fair

**RECEIVED**

NOV 04 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

pat engel  
4901 henry hudson pkwy  
bronx, NY 10471-3217

November 3, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

pat engel

**Stephanie Kost**

---

**From:** Nestor Miranda [nmiranda@tracfone.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 29, 2003 2:38 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Nestor Miranda  
Project Manager  
13816 SW 38 Lane  
Miami, FL 33175-6491

October 29, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Nestor  
Project Manager



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Nestor Miranda [nmirand@tracfone.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 28, 2003 11:26 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

Nestor Miranda  
13816 SW 38 Lane  
Miami, FL 33175-6491

October 28, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Nestor

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Stephanie Kost**

---

**From:** N Mir [nmiranda@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 29, 2003 2:29 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

N Mir  
13816 SW 38 Lane  
Miami, FL 33175-6491

October 29, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 19 2003**

**Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Thank you for helping us in this very important issue. We will communicate your concern to your elected official and various members of the Federal Communications Commission.

To learn more about TracFone Wireless, the largest independent prepaid wireless service provider in the U.S., feel free to visit us at <http://www.tracfone.com>.

Thank you again for your support.

Sincerely,

NM

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 19 2003**

**Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Marion Edridge [medr5406@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 12, 2003 4:17 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Note Regarding USF

Marion Edridge  
09411385843  
112 35th Square SW  
Vero Beach, FL 32968-3100

RECEIVED  
DEC 19 2003  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

November 12, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Marion Edridge  
09411385843

**Stephanie Kost**

---

**From:** JSCIRCO@AOL.COM  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 11, 2003 10:07 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Universal Service Fee Complaint

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 19 2003**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

<PROCEEDING>96-45  
<DATE>11/11/03  
<NAME>JOANNE S. CIRCO  
<ADDRESS1>20 COLERIDGE ROAD  
<ADDRESS2>  
<CITY>HOLBROOK  
<STATE>NY  
<ZIP>11741

<LAW-FIRM>n/a

<ATTORNEY>n/a

<FILE-NUMBER>n/a

<DOCUMENT-TYPE>CO

<PHONE-NUMBER>631-585-2114

<DESCRIPTION>Universal Service Fund Complaint <CONTACT-EMAIL>JSCIRCO@AOL.COM <TEXT>

Federal Communications Commission

445 12th Street, SW

Room 8B201

Washington, D.C. 20554

(202) 418-1000 phone

Chairman Michael K. Powell

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Reference: FCC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD  
File No. L-00-72.

Dear FCC:

I am writing to complain about the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund and requesting that the FCC investigate this matter further before changing the current policy. Your proposed \$1.00 per month charge for all wireless phones will directly impact my ability to retain my wireless service.

I do not think it is fair to charge EVERYBODY \$1.00 dollar regardless of how they use their wireless phone, especially for a low-volume user that relies on wireless service for safety and security, not interstate calls. The current policy is fair, based on interstate usage, and should be left alone. Please do not penalize us. Keep this fair.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. Please provide a written response indicating the status/resolution of this matter.

Very truly yours,

JOANNE S. CIRCO  
20 COLERIDGE ROAD

CC: FCC Subcommittee Members

**Stephanie Kost**

---

**From:** John Meiser [aura2@efn.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 07, 2003 12:03 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Note Regarding USF

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 19 2003**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

John Meiser  
1150 West 15th Ave. #101  
Eugene, OR 97402-3902

November 7, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

John Meiser

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Jerry Wagoner [jkendoll@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 03, 2003 2:59 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** The "F" Word

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Michael K. Powell and Commissioner's Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Michael J. Copps, Kevin J. Martin, and Jonathan S. Adelstein:

I hope that you all realize what a dangerous decision you've made in allowing the "F" word to be used on television. Is it any wonder why all over the world, the US is considered the cesspool of morality? It is due to lamebrain decisions like this on that we are viewed in that manner.

Do you realize that the immoral people in the United States represent a small population compared to the God fearing Americans whom are outraged by this? All you've done is drive another nail in the casket of America. Without God and without morality, we are no better than the heathen nations we seek to liberate. With our sort of freedom, it is no wonder they don't even want us to free them and rebel against our freedom forces.

Religion aside, cursing is still considered as rudimentary, impolite, inconsiderate, and just plain "the language of idiots". Not to mention our kids won't be able to get jobs when they all have potty mouths you helped create. It is my job to monitor the programs my kids watch. It is your job to monitor the television networks and cables channels to be sure they are obeying the law.

You have failed miserably and our country will reap what you have sewn. I hope you'll wake up and realize that you're not representing mainstream America, but a few rebels who can't hold a decent job.

A concerned citizen,  
Jerry Wagoner  
630 W. Church St.  
Galion, OH 44833  
(419)835-7284

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Exclusive Video Premiere - Britney Spears <http://launch.yahoo.com/promos/britneyspears/>

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Jennifer Nordheimer [jln@idi.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 29, 2003 2:04 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Note Regarding USF

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 19 2003**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Jennifer Nordheimer  
7001 Carmichael Avenue  
Bethesda, MD 20817-4611

September 29, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Jennifer Nordheimer



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Golden, Michael [mgolden@state.pa.us]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 20, 2003 10:30 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Nomination for Universal Service Administrative Company

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

November 20, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of: Nomination for Universal Service Administrative Company  
Board of Directors, CC Docket Nos. 97-21 and 96-45

Dear Commissioner Abernathy:

On behalf of the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and the public schools and libraries in our Commonwealth, I am writing to express our support for the nomination of Alaska State E-rate Coordinator, Della Matthis, to the Board of Directors of the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC).

You may be wondering why would the Pennsylvania Department of Education be supporting the nomination of an individual from another state?

We have closely observed the original nominations and appointments to the (then) Schools and Libraries Corporation (SLC) board, and all appointments since 1997. The individuals that have been appointed to the board representing schools have been leaders of national organizations, not persons with education, school, or first-hand E-rate experience. And while we understand that such representation was crucial in the beginning of the program, we now believe the board should be have representation from actual E-rate practitioners.

The USAC and SLD boards would benefit greatly from an individual that has served at the state department of education level, as well as someone who is in daily contact with school and library applicants, and state E-rate coordinators from 39 other states.

Ms. Matthis is an active leader in the State E-rate Coordinators' Alliance, participating in weekly conference calls with 39 other states, the Federal Communications Commission staff, and Schools and Libraries Division Staff. Her efforts have been to not only act as an advocate for the schools and libraries of Alaska, but also as an advocate for the program itself.

It is because we believe she will bring this much-needed school applicant perspective that we strongly support her nomination. We know she will be a highly respected representative for both the universal service programs and the schools in all states and territories.

Sincerely,

L. Michael Golden  
Director  
Office of Educational Technology  
Pennsylvania Department of Education  
333 Market Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333  
717-705-4486  
717-346-4216 direct  
717-783-5420 fax

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

## Stephanie Kost

**From:** thomas\_dunleavy@dps.state.ny.us  
**Sent:** Monday, October 27, 2003 2:19 PM  
**To:** Billy Jack Gregg  
**Cc:** Anita Cheng; Barb Meisenheimer; Bob Rowe; Carl Johnson; Carol Matthey; David Dowds; Daniel Gonzalez; Diane Law-Hsu; Eric Einhorn; Greg Fogleman; Commissioner Adelstein; Joel Shifman; Jonathan Adelstein; Kathleen Abernathy; Katie King; Katherine Lapin; Katherine Schroder; Kevin Martin; Lila Jaber; Lori Kenyon; Lisa Zaina; Matthew Brill; Mike Lee; Nan Thompson; Peter Bluhm; McClelland, Phil; POUCHER.EARL; Scott Bergmann; Shannon Lipp; William Scher  
**Subject:** Re: Responses to Nan's Questions

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary



Nan's Single Lines  
Questions.d...

The following thoughts are in response to the questions raised by Nan:

1). I agree with Bill Jack. Yes, I assume that any changes we make in the availability of USF (portability, ETC designations, primary line, service standards, etc.) should apply in all service areas, rural and non-rural. Similarly, the growth in funding due to supporting CETC's that causes concern should be addressed in both rural and non-rural areas.

I don't think it necessarily follows that a determination to support only a single connection per customer or household requires rebasing support. Indeed, rebasing support so that the ETC receives support based on all its (or more accurately, the ILEC's) lines, rather than just its primary lines, would be similar to supporting a primary carrier rather than a primary line. In effect, you would be supporting more than just the customer's primary line.

The rebasing that has been suggested is, apparently, intended to preserve, at least initially, the existing rural ILEC's support levels. The primary line support proposal contemplates that as customers choose competing carriers for their primary service the incumbent will lose some funding, so the preservation of support might be short-lived. Rebasing support would seem to be a transitional mechanism that might mitigate any sudden reduction in ETC's support upon changing to primary line support. Long term, my preference would be to see per line support calculated based on the estimated cost of providing one primary line in each service area -- rural and non-rural.

I don't think the primary line methodology necessarily implicates either the 135% or the two standard deviation benchmarks. It is likely that carriers' support will decrease or increase because their standing relative to their peers --the national averages-- based on total cost may differ from their ranking based only on primary cost. While it may be possible to adjust the benchmarks up or down to keep support constant on average, it may not be possible to do so in a way that would hold each ETC harmless because each ETC will have a different ratio of total to primary lines.

I'm not sure I understand why primary line support is unfair. The artificial ratcheting up of per line support that will result as the CLEC's gain market share (because constant ILEC total costs get divided by ever-decreasing ILEC lines) is a reason support is better calculated by estimating the per line cost to serve in each area. Maybe the current non-rural model is not the best way to make those estimates but it might be worthwhile to try to find one.

Regards,  
Tom Dunleavy  
212-290-4416

"Billy Jack Gregg" <bjgregg@cad.state.wv.us>  
10/27/2003 12:09 PM

To: "Thomas Dunleavy" <thomas\_dunleavy@dps.state.ny.us>, "Anita Cheng" <acheng@fcc.gov>, "Barb Meisenheimer" <bmeisenheimer@ded.state.mo.us>, "Bill Scher" <wscher@fcc.gov>, "Bob Rowe" <browe@state.mt.us>, "Carl Johnson" <carl\_johnson@dps.state.ny.us>, "Carol Matthey" <cmatthey@fcc.gov>, "Daniel Gonzalez" <dgonzale@fcc.gov>, "David Dowds" <DDowds@psc.state.fl.us>, "Diane Law Hsu" <DLAWHSU@fcc.gov>, "Eric Einhorn" <eeinhorn@fcc.gov>, "Greg Fogleman" <gfoglema@psc.state.fl.us>, "Joel Shifman" <joel.shifman@state.me.us>, "Jonathan Adelstein" <jadelste@fcc.gov>, "Jonathan Adelstein" <jsa@fcc.gov>, "Katherine Lapin" <klapin@fcc.gov>, "Katherine Schroder" <klischrod@fcc.gov>, "Kathleen Abernathy" <kabernat@fcc.gov>, "Katie King" <kking@fcc.gov>, "Kevin Martin" <kmartin@fcc.gov>, "Lila Jaber" <LJaber@psc.state.fl.us>, "Lisa Zaina" <lzaina@fcc.gov>, "Lori Kenyon" <lorraine\_kenyon@rca.state.ak.us>, "Matt Brill" <mbrill@fcc.gov>, "McClelland, Phil" <pmcclelland@paoca.org>, "Mike Lee" <mlee@state.mt.us>, "Nan Thompson" <nanette\_thompson@rca.state.ak.us>, "Peter Bluhm" <PBluhm@psb.state.vt.us>, "POUCHER.EARL" <POUCHER.EARL@leg.state.fl.us>, "Scott Bergmann" <scott.bergmann@fcc.gov>, "Shannon Lipp" <slipp@fcc.gov>  
cc:  
Subject: Responses to Nan's Questions

Attached are my responses to Nan's questions concerning support based on primary lines.

Billy Jack

<<...>>

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Stephanie Kost

**From:** tal1957@schuylkill.com  
**Sent:** Monday, October 06, 2003 11:57 PM  
**To:** Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KM KJMWEB; ECPS  
**Cc:** tal1957@schuylkill.com; senator@inouye.senate.gov; john\_kerry@kerry.senate.gov; senator@breaux.senate.gov; senator@rockefeller.senate.gov; senator@dorgan.senate.gov; senator@boxer.senate.gov; senator\_carnahan@carnahan.senate.gov; conrad\_burns@burns.senate.gov; senatorlott@lott.senate.gov; senator@hutchison.senate.gov; olympia@snowe.senate.gov; oregon@gsmith.senate.gov; tellupton@mail.house.gov; christopher.cox@mail.house.gov; ask.heather@mail.house.gov; vito.fossella@mail.house.gov; blunt@mail.house.gov; tom.davis@mail.house.gov; ehrlich@mail.house.gov; talk2lee@mail.house.gov; ninthnet@mail.house.gov  
**Subject:** Universal Service Fee Complaint

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

<PROCEEDING>96-45  
<DATE>10/06/03  
<NAME>Thomas A. Linkchorst  
<ADDRESS1>478 W. Frack St.  
<ADDRESS2>  
<CITY>Frackville  
<STATE>PA  
<ZIP>17931  
<LAW-FIRM>n/a  
<ATTORNEY>n/a  
<FILE-NUMBER>n/a  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE>CO  
<PHONE-NUMBER>570-874-4436  
<DESCRIPTION>Universal Service Fund Complaint <CONTACT-EMAIL>tal1957@schuylkill.com  
<TEXT>

Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room 8B201  
Washington, D.C. 20554  
(202) 418-1000 phone

Chairman Michael K. Powell  
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Reference: FCC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

Dear FCC:

I am writing to complain about the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund and requesting that the FCC investigate this matter further before changing the current policy. Your proposed \$1.00 per month charge for all wireless phones will directly impact my ability to retain my wireless service.

I do not think it is fair to charge EVERYBODY \$1.00 dollar regardless of how they use their wireless phone, especially for a low-volume user that relies on wireless service for safety and security, not interstate calls. The current policy is fair, based on interstate usage, and should be left alone. Please do not penalize us. Keep this fair.

Dear FCC:

I have and keep my wireless service for EMERGENCY use ONLY! I'm not like most of the people who use it for work and nonsense talk. I even pull over to the side of the road WHEN I do use it. And I keep it turned off until I do need to use it. I use my pager the most, the next thing your going to do is charge the U.S.F. for them.

Thank you for hearing me out.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. Please provide a written response

indicating the status/resolution of this matter.

Very truly yours,

Thomas A. Linkchorst  
478 W. Frack St.

CC: FCC Subcommittee Members

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Stephanie Kost**

---

**From:** Stuart LeVine [sblevine@attglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 05, 2003 4:40 PM  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Subject:** Opposed to Change in USF Collection

Stuart LeVine  
7100 Maybrook Drive  
Las Vegas, NV 89129-6507

October 5, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein  
FCC  
445 12th Street SW  
Washington, DC 20554

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 19 2003**

*Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary*

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

Charging \$1.00 a month is entirely fair. To raise a fuss about such a small amount of money is a complete waste of everyone's time.

Sincerely,

Stuart LeVine

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Stuart LeVine [sblevine@attglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 05, 2003 4:40 PM  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Subject:** Opposed to Change in USF Collection

Stuart LeVine  
7100 Maybrook Drive  
Las Vegas, NV 89129-6507

October 5, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Michael Copps  
FCC  
445 12th Street SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Copps:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

Charging \$1.00 a month is entirely fair. To raise a fuss about such a small amount of money is a complete waste of everyone's time.

Sincerely,

Stuart LeVine

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Steven Smelser [djem60@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 15, 2003 4:38 AM  
**To:** Michael Powell  
**Subject:** Opposed to Change in USF Collection

Steven Smelser  
18 Waldmann Mill CT  
Baltimore, MD 21236-2943

October 15, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael Powell  
FCC  
445 12th Street SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Steven Smelser

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary